



THE
SELLOUT
OF THE AGES

—By Howard Scott

TECHNOCRACY
INC.

155 EAST 44TH ST., NEW YORK, NEW YORK

10 CENTS

First Reprint, September, 1942
Published by Continental Headquarters, Technocracy Inc.
155 East 44th St., New York, N. Y.

Copyright 1941
Technocracy Inc.

This article was written originally less than four months after fascist Europe invaded Russia in 1941 and two months before fascist Japan attacked the United States of America. The march of events in the ensuing year have underwritten the validity of Technocracy's analysis and emphasized its importance. Supplementary literature is available.

Printed in U.S.A.

From Technocracy A-21 November 1941

THE SELLOUT OF THE AGES

By Howard Scott

Director-in-Chief, Technocracy Inc.

PART I: WORLD PANORAMA

THE UNITED STATES is engaged in creating the gigantic structure called for in fulfilling its national defense program. Our government has proclaimed to the world that the United States shall be 'the arsenal of democracy.' The nation is irrevocably committed to the policy of opposing the aggressor nations and of rendering all possible aid to those nations opposing the aggressor nations. Clarification of this statement means that the United States has proclaimed itself to be the supporter of Great Britain, China, and Russia, and a sympathizer with all of the governments in exile. The aggressor nations are Germany, Italy, Japan, and their unmentioned satellites.

The government of these United States has legislated into being one Lease-Lend Act of \$7 billion, and is in the process of passing a second Lease-Lend Act of approximately \$6 billion. These are definite commitments for leasing and lending to the

nations now engaged in opposing aggressor nations. The entire fiscal program of the United States in becoming the arsenal of democracy has already expended and earmarked more than \$66 billion by this date of October 10, 1941. This nation has already invested \$66 billion in a war program. This nation is in a state of war. (True, this nation has not as yet reached a shooting war but the shooting may begin at any time, now or in the next few years.) If the United States continues to be the arsenal of democracy until the fall of 1943, we shall in fact have become the greatest arsenal in all the world.

This will require that the national budget in 1942 and 1943 shall be in excess of \$40 billion for each budget year. It is estimated that the cost of Continental defense of this country and this Continent will exceed \$100 billion. The cost of the Lease-Lend activities will be enormous but the total cannot

be estimated at the present time unless we are able to predict the end of the war which at this moment is far from ascertainable. The United States is already committed to the greatest national war expenditure of any nation in history. Will this be a long war or a short war? That depends on many unknown factors.

Policing the World

The United States of America is in a peculiar world historical position in that as a nation it is already committed to a foreign policy involving it nationally in the world's greatest investment in the plant and production of the munitions of war. This investment and this plant and this production will vastly exceed all current estimates of future expansion if continued for two years more.

The further expansion and the ultimate size of our arsenal of democracy depends on whether Russia can maintain herself as our only fighting ally against the oppressor nations. Russia is the only one of our belligerent allies that has the manpower, the territory, and the spiritual fortitude sufficient to achieve and maintain large-scale military operations. If Russia maintains herself and keeps her armies in full fighting condition without too much loss in equipment and manpower until next May or June, American aid then could be supplied in such volume as to lend effective support. Will American aid to Russia be the same empty phrase that it was to Yugoslavia and Greece—too late with too little?

We are aiding Great Britain with ships, food, planes, and other materiel. Our aid to Britain has enabled Britain to survive as

one and one-third islands off the coast of an ideological continent.

Great Britain has a population of 47 million. Her industrial capacity is far inferior to that of her European enemy. This may be illustrated by citing the ratio of steel capacity, namely: Great Britain, under the forced draft of her war program can produce 15 million tons a year compared to Europe's 42 million tons. It is obvious that Great Britain has neither enough manpower nor industrial capacity to equal, let alone exceed, that of her opponent. It is correct on the other hand that the British Empire exceeds in population the population total of the enemy, but the industrial capacity of the British Empire is still far below that of Europe.

The administration in Washington, in briefing the case of American aid to Britain, has dwelt at some length on the fact that the only armed force that stood between conquering, militant Europe and the United States was the British Navy. President Roosevelt, ably assisted by Navy Secretary Knox, has on many occasions voiced the opinion that the British Navy alone prevented Europe from carrying the war to the Continent of North America. Secretary Knox in a speech on October 2, 1941, came forward with the proposal that the United States and Great Britain form a protective alliance for 100 years and that through such an alliance Great Britain and the United States could police the world with superior seapower and thus save civilization from going to perdition for at least another century.

(It is to be noted here that Great Britain and the United States, under the thesis of Secretary Knox, are the nations which are going to do the policing. Of these two,

the United States has most of the manpower and most of the resources and technology.)

The fallacy of such a proposition is immediately apparent to any trained technologist. In the evolution of naval battleships from the ancient trireme to the modern dreadnaught there have been a succession of developments enabling each succeeding naval age to fight the naval engagements farther and farther off shore. The ancient galley could not fight at sea but only within the quiet waters of landlocked bays. The modern cruiser and the battlewagon can cruise the oceans of the world and fight each other beyond sight of the crews. Admiral Mahan, in his *The Influence of Seapower on History*, created the naval bible upon which the modern British and United States naval policy has been erected. Admiral Mahan is dead. His theory of seapower will be buried forever within this decade.

The Fallacy of Naval World Patrol

Airpower has come to stay.

Airpower in quantity, although obsolescent in design, drove the British fleet out of the Skagerrak, drove the fleet and the British out of Norway, and chased it out of the North Sea. It made a shambles of Dunkirk. It has wrecked the greatest of European seaports. It made a naval junk yard out of Crete. It has rendered the Mediterranean a hazardous waterway, and in the Atlantic has chased the battlefleets far off shore.

The airpower of tomorrow will make the airpower of today as antiquated as a model T would be on our highways now. The

final downfall of naval power only awaits that day when some one country does produce fleets of bombers having 6,000 miles or more range and carrying 25 to 50 tons of bombs each. That day is almost here. It may not be done next week or next month but it will be done almost certainly within the next two years, and when that day arrives the battlewagon of 35-, 45-, or 60,000 tons becomes a death wagon of scrap metal. When that day arrives naval power will be relegated to its correct position of a fast naval scouting patrol with long cruising range capable of high maneuverability and intended for fighting a delaying action only. *The offensive will no longer reside in the naval power of the nation but in its airpower of long-range continental bombers.*

To be forewarned is to be forearmed. The present naval policy of the United States is for a two-ocean fleet. That two-ocean fleet is already coming off the shipways, but let us have the foresight to plan for no more. It is time the United States of America stopped preparing to be the world's naval junk man to Davey Jones. But the strength of the Navy bloc has always far exceeded that of the Army in influencing Congress and business in the United States; it is extremely unlikely that anything short of a major disaster will compel a change in our naval policy.

The United States today is the greatest naval base in the world in the sense that it is building more naval ships than all the rest of the world. It is also repairing all the major injuries to the British fleet. Our navy yards have as high as 25 to 30 British ships of war undergoing repairs at one time. This indicates only too well that the airpower of fascist Europe has rendered untenable most British naval bases and wiped

out a good many of their shipyards. It also clearly shows that British navy yards and shipyards cannot be protected by naval seapower and that Great Britain up to date has not had sufficient airpower 'supremacy' to protect its navy yards well enough to permit major repairs on its injured naval vessels. Clydeside is no more.

Russia and British Statesmanship

History is ironic. From August 2, 1914 until late 1917 Russian armies on the eastern front fought several million troops of the German and Austro-Hungarian armies. Russia in the first three years of the First World War saved the Allies: Russia prevented the full force of the military might of the Central Powers from being turned against the Allies in the West. Russia's total casualties (9,150,000) practically equalled the combined casualties (9,351,000) of France and the British Empire. The blood of the Russia of the Czars saved the democracies of the West. That great sacrifice enabled the Allies to gain the time in which to mobilize their force. Russia withdrew from the war against Germany in 1917 and finally made peace with Germany at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Russia, the fighting ally of Great Britain, suffering a breakdown of its economic structure, went into social revolution. Russia made peace with Germany but did not become an ally of Germany.

In the spring of 1918, while Germany and the Allies were still at war, Winston Churchill—Churchill of Gallipoli, Amiens, and Zeebrugge—had the British fleet land Major General Poole and 20,000 British soldiers at Narvik, Norway. They travelled

overland via the Narvik-Kiruna railroad to Finland to attack the Finnish Autonomous Soviet Republic. This attack was launched in conjunction with the landing of General von der Goltz and 30,000 German soldiers at Hangoe in south Finland (April 1918) accompanied by General Mannerheim, that Balto-German ex-Czarist officer. It is interesting to note that the cooperation of British and German troops occurred while Germany and Great Britain were still at war.

In the spring of 1918 the British occupied Murmansk, and later in 1918 an Allied Expeditionary Force composed of British, French, Serbian, Italian, and American forces occupied the Russian port of Archangel on the White Sea. The British fleet entered the Baltic and attacked the Russian ports and seacoast cities. It subsequently landed General Yudenich and 11,000 troops on the Gulf of Finland. General Yudenich, supported by the British fleet, attempted the capture of Petrograd (Leningrad); he was defeated and the British fleet turned back.

The British fleet invaded the Black Sea and took over, with the aid of subsidized Russian renegades, the Black Sea fleet of Russia. It landed and supported General Denikin and his army and provided the material support that carried Denikin and his ill-fated expedition almost to the gates of Moscow and to military disaster. The British fleet in the Black Sea, in cooperation with the British overland expedition from Persia, captured and destroyed the Russian oil fields of Baku.

Simultaneously from Vladivostock the Allies launched Admiral Kolchak westward for his conquest of Russia supported by 30,000 British, 20,000 French, 30,000 Americans, and 70,000 Japanese. The Allies withdrew at Archangel; Denikin was de-

feated; Baron Wrangel was defeated and transported to Constantinople by the Allies in 1920; Admiral Kolchak was shot one morning for breakfast; and the Allies withdrew from Siberia through Vladivostock after a vain but glorious attempt at military conquest by undeclared warfare on their former ally.

The insular position of the British Isles in conjunction with the possession of ample available resources of high grade iron ore, tin, copper, and coal, practically decreed her leadership in the inauguration of the industrial revolution. Her insularity in pre-airpower days guaranteed her an immunity from foreign invasion and the time for uninterrupted pioneer development and transition from a simple land and feudal state to that of machine-power manufacturing. Great Britain's resources provided the industrial raw materials to feed her growing industrial power.

It was only natural that the British Isles should for a century or two hold the leading position in the industrial revolutionizing of the world. It was only natural that sooner or later, and mostly sooner, the continent of Europe, possessing larger resource-capacities than the British Isles, should ultimately outdistance Britain in the production of both raw and finished materials. It is only natural that today semi-industrialized Europe has far outdistanced the British Isles in her volume and eminence of industrial position.

The industrial dominance of the British Isles for over two centuries was the genesis of British statesmanship, a statesmanship of British Empire imperialism wherein the British Isles shipped their manufactured goods around the world in all fields of trade

in order to perpetuate Britain as the world's manufacturing middleman and a nation of shopkeepers. This process on the part of the British economy created the greatest accumulation of monetary wealth in social history. Its surplus monetary wealth as investment capital made London the monetary capital of the world and dominated the private pursuit of trade everywhere in the world before the First World War.

As early as the year 1900 the development of machine-power production in other countries was rapidly overtaking that of the British Isles and in the years between 1900 and 1913 her production and output was surpassed in many lines by several countries. The resource position of the British Isles even prior to the First World War was a declining one, but her actual position was not apparent because of the immense returns from her foreign investment, her marine transportation, and her empire trade and monopoly of certain basic materials.

Great Britain in 1914 was the dominant seapower of the world. Great Britain in 1939 was still the dominant seapower of the world, but of a totally different world.

British statesmanship has always sought to exercise, through treaties and alliances with one or more continental European powers, the most efficacious use of its dominance of seapower in maintaining a European power politic. This statesmanship of Great Britain has always necessitated that British seapower be allied with and reinforced by a major European landpower with sufficient geographical area, resources, and manpower to provide an armed land force sufficient to sustain the action of British seapower in its economic strangulation of the sea trade routes. Great Britain has always sought landpower allies on the

continent of Europe. Let it be stated here that British seapower only became efficacious against a major European power when supported by a simultaneous action of the military land forces of another major European power. *Therefore it has been a tradition of British statesmanship that Great Britain should have a strong offensive-and-defensive alliance with a major European power capable of maintaining and feeding large field armies in action.*

Of course the reader here probably will point out that Britain's association with France filled all of the traditional requirements of British statesmanship. This is a gross error. France as a nation was a traditional enemy of the British. Its culture and its way of life and its process of producing physical wealth was opposed to that of the people of Britain. Furthermore, France had neither the geography, the geological resources, the industrial equipment, nor the manpower to offset the industrial and physical preponderance of that of Germany.

It is staggering to realize that the tory, conservative leadership of British statesmanship, in choosing the wrong European landpower ally to support British seapower, abandoned the acumen that British statesmanship had developed over three centuries of practice. The tory imperialist of Great Britain abandoned all the long-range potentialities of traditional British statesmanship. This error was committed in the year 1918 and, although Britain and her Allies won World War Number One, this error, committed 23 years ago, is so monumental that it has

jeopardized every action of British policy since that time. It is doubtful at this moment if British statesmanship can ever retrieve its previous position in the world of affairs. British tory imperialists from 1918 on deliberately, by planned intention, sold out the future welfare of the British nation for the mess of pottage of their own personal economic interest.

World War Number One ceased with the armistice of November 11, 1918, and the articles of peace were finally laid down in the Treaty of Versailles. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey were the vanquished nations. The enmities arising out of a prolonged and disastrous military struggle have never yet formed a basis for the immediate alliance of two major opponents.

Germany was the leading industrial power of Europe in 1918 even after her defeat. Defeated Germany on January 1, 1919, had more industrial equipment extant and capable of operation than she had when she entered the War in 1914. It was a fact that France, as one of the victorious Allies, had the largest armed force in Europe, but the industrial position of France was a minor one and it needed no trained technologist to point out that in the years to come the industrial position of France would be a shrinking shadow.

Only one power in Europe possessed the land area, the manpower, and the resources to have fitted accurately the specifications of a European land ally prescribed by the traditions of British statesmanship——

That power was Soviet Russia.

Stumblebum Statesmanship

Great Britain and her Allies won the First World War. Britain without allies in the First World War would have gone down to defeat. In 1919 it needed no prophet to point out that British statesmanship should have immediately set to work to affect a *fait accompli* that would have provided a compensation in the years to come to offset the declining industrial position of the British Isles. A program of resource development and industrialization should have been inaugurated by British statesmanship in Australia, Canada, South Africa, and India in conjunction with a foreign policy of acting as the chief provider of capital goods for Soviet Russia.

This would have involved tremendous capital loans to Russia and the British overseas dominions. British manufacturing industries would have hummed to capacity; British industrial capacity would have expanded. This policy, had it been adopted by British statesmanship, would have won the undying gratitude and friendship of the Canadians, the Australians, the South Africans, the Russians, and at least some of the Indians. If this policy had been inaugurated by British statesmanship, there would have been no dole in Britain in the past 20 years and the British people would have been adequately and properly fed, so much so that this generation of Britains entering their majority would have faced their future a taller and healthier people.

British statesmanship and British leadership turned down the opportunity and in turning down this opportunity brought on the present bankruptcy of British statesmanship. National opportunities do not knock twice. Individuals may make mistakes and

commit errors and live to repeat them; nations can do so only once.

The question arises here: What were the forces that caused British leadership and British statesmanship to nationally underwrite the bankruptcy of the very thing they represented?

The personnel of British leadership and British statesmanship has been mainly composed of those from out of the British nobility, landed gentry, and upper class incomes, and their relatives by descent and marriage. The national stewardship of Great Britain and her future was securely held and controlled in the main by these social classifications to such an astounding degree that, while Britain was a constitutional monarchy with representative government, these social classifications had arrived at such a dominance of the national picture that in 1939 over 53 members of the House of Commons were related by blood or marriage to the membership of the House of Peers! This economic dominance of the social structure of Great Britain had so conditioned the upper class income structure through two centuries of receiving the benefactions of their economic position that they were only capable of exercising a leadership and statesmanship that was a policy of protection for the sources of their individual incomes. All the qualities and capacities necessary for the navigation of the national ship of state apparently deserted these tory imperialists the moment that changing world conditions called upon them loudly for the setting of a new national course.

The coming of social revolution in Russia abrogated innumerable foreign investments (of which the three outstanding were the British, French, and Belgian) in that country. London for many years was the

center of promotion of corporate enterprises for the exploitation of Russian resources. Corporations were formed and capital issues floated, and British capital subscribed heavily. The list of promotion of Russian enterprises in London was enormous. They ranged far and wide over Russian territory. Many of them made handsome profits and paid large dividends to their British as well as to some American stockholders.

Foreign capital financed steel plants, machinery, chemical, and other manufacturing plants in Russia plus various mining enterprises such as manganese, gold, copper and, last but not least, oil. French capital was heavily invested in many of the enterprises in the Donetz Basin. Such names as Baku, Maikop, Tanalyk, and Lena River were magic words in the corporation prospectuses of London financial-house promotion.

The tory imperialist leadership of Great Britain not only used the armed forces of their nation and of their allies in direct attack on Soviet Russia, but instigated and supported all kinds of counter revolution around the borders of that country. Even the ARA, the American Relief Administration, under the chairmanship of Herbert Hoover, was used in an attempt to economically coerce famine stricken Russia into permitting the return of British private enterprises to their previous profitable exploitation of Russian resources and concessions. Leslie Urquhart had a lot of friends.

World War Number One made a long-term enemy of the German people, but British statesmanship capped the situation by 20 years of the most pernicious intrigue in an attempt to defeat Soviet Russia and make a permanent enemy out of her too. That Russia succeeded in building up the beginning of a widespread technological pro-

ductive equipment and manning it with an operating personnel, that they succeeded in building one of the largest armed forces in the world, although still incompletely equipped, was not done because of any British or American assistance *but in spite of the stumblebum generalship of the tory imperialist over the last 20 years.*

On June 22, 1941, Germany launched an attack on the U.S.S.R. over the entire front ranging from the Black Sea to the Arctic. Finland and Rumania joined with Germany and Hungary in supplying troops for this attack. Italy has since joined in the fray by sending several divisions to the Russian front. Even French, Belgian, and Spanish token troops have been sent to the eastern battle line. The Russo-German battle front is the most gigantic single battle front of all history. Hitler and the German High Command admit that Germany and her allies have 6,000,000 troops engaging the Russians from the Black Sea to the Arctic.

History is ironic.

Once again Russia stands between Great Britain and historical oblivion. Twenty-four years ago the Russians were their 'noble allies'; today they are allies but not 'noble.' Once again millions of Russians are dying, fighting the Germans and the Hungarians and the Austrians plus others. Russia may possibly be able to survive her tremendous losses and fight the organized might of fascist Europe to a standstill—a stalemate—but the odds of industrial production and existing military equipment are on the side of the fascist powers.

This then, raises the question, two questions: A fascist peace forced upon Soviet Russia? Or total defeat for Russia as a major power?

In case number one, a fascist-forced peace, Russia would be compelled to act willingly or unwillingly as a supplier of raw material. In the case of utter defeat the entire Russian economy would be taken over by the fascist forces and all the vast area of Russia and its resources, manpower, and food would become subject to the regimented slavery of European fascism.

If Russia has peace forced upon it or is overwhelmed by defeat in the near future, Great Britain will be only one and one-third islands off the coast of a European fascist continent. If that occurs, Great Britain can be conquered at will by fascist Europe for less than one-half the present cost of the Russian campaign. In that case the British government might, too, become a government in exile to be joined overseas by the British fleet. The British fleet, if forced to leave Britain and her European bases, can be based only on two other places in the world. One is in United States ports and bases, and the other is in the Singapore, Batavia, Port Darwin, Melbourne, and Sydney area. Canada has neither the fuel nor the naval bases with which to support a major naval fleet. In the case of the British government in exile and the evacuation of the British fleet from its home waters, the United States would likely fall heir to most of the British fleet and to the goodwill maintenance of the British government in exile.

In the other alternative—a negotiated peace between Europe and Britain—Great Britain would be compelled to acknowledge fascist sovereignty over continental Europe and the previous foreign possessions of European pre-fascist powers. In a negotiated peace with Britain European fascism would undoubtedly guarantee the economic position

of the entire British nobility and upper classes, in return for which they would no doubt insist upon the British Empire becoming a world wide stooge for the furtherance of fascist trade and supply.

Such a situation could not be tolerated on the North American Continent by the United States. The United States would be compelled to take immediate action should this occur, and that action would no doubt result in the taking over of the entire British possessions on the North American Continent by force of arms. There are grave doubts as to whether Australia, New Zealand and Tasmania would tolerate such action on the part of the British Empire.

British Public—British Leadership

The British people have given plenty of evidence that they wholeheartedly support Russian participation and welcome Russia as their ally. The British press and public are not satisfied in the efforts of their government in providing aid for their ally. There is a clamor from all sections of the British Isles, constantly growing in volume, for greater aid and assistance to Russia.

There is more than sufficient evidence available to prove that British leadership was fully aware of the contemplated German attack upon Russia from 3 to 5 weeks prior to June 22, 1941. Weeks before the German advance into Russia began, British press associations released dispatches on the vast mobilization of German troops on the Russian frontier and of growing friction between Hitler and Stalin. The British government, in warning the world that such an attack would occur from 3 to 5 weeks prior to its occurrence, must have had some prior

knowledge. Yet in over 4 months of the Russian campaign there is no evidence that British leadership has made any attempt whatsoever to create a secondary diversion front on the European continent.*

British leadership sacrificed the BEF in France—when the British, as far back as 1934, were possessed of the knowledge that *France would sell them out*. (This knowledge, by the way, was also known to the State Department and the Intelligence Department of the United States). The British sacrificed men and equipment in the futile gesture of Norway and in another forlorn hope in Greece and Crete. They made all of these sacrifices when there was nothing to gain by any of these actions, and yet here, in over 4 months of practically total inactivity when the creation of a secondary front on the European Continent would have been of the greatest importance, no action has occurred.

The question arises: Why was British leadership so willing to undertake these previous futile sacrifices of men and materials when there was no possibility of gain on the horizon, when in the first 4 months of war on the Russian front the creation of even a similar sacrifice would have been of untold benefit to the general cause?

The attitude of the British public is one thing; the attitude of the British leadership is another. They appear to be diametrically opposed.

Great Britain is still not at war with Finland.† The only action that the British are

* *At the end of 14 months this same condition still held.*

† *Great Britain has since declared war on Finland.*

taking is bombing raids on enemy territories. On the Libyan front the action has been that of reprisals and patrol sorties—The Syrian campaign had a distinctly bad odor to it—it was not a complete military conquest. The odor will not become repugnant until the full agreement with General Denz is brought to light. The action in Iraq was of a minor nature, while in Iran another odor is developing. It seems that in Persia (Iran) the Russians used many more troops than the British, and occupied more territory than the British thought was necessary. Propaganda releases from Iran, since the taking over, show that the British are much more worried over whether the Russians will retain Iranian territory than they are of effecting closer cooperation with their fighting ally.

In the first 6 months of this war in the stalemate of the Maginot Line and the Siegfried Line it was dubbed a 'phoney war.' Maybe those who created that slogan were correct. It is a real war, but there are a lot of phoney actions taking place. Did Rudolph Hess only land once on the Duke of Hamilton's estate, or was he shot down on *leaving* that area for the third time as authoritative sources claim?

Many of the upper class British were avowed fascists and many more were fascist sympathizers.* One has only to look back to '38 and '39 at the list of sponsors and directors of the Anglo-German Fellowship and The Link to find thereon the names of such outstanding upper class British names as Lord Redesdale, Lord Aberdare, Lord Arnold, Marquess of Carisbrooke, Viscount Esher, Earl of Glasgow, Lord Hollenden, Marquess of Lothian, Viscount Nuffield, Lord Stamp, and many others. Sir Barry Domvile (one time head of the British

Naval Intelligence, now under arrest in the Tower of London) was Chairman of The Link. Last, but not least, was Lord Halifax, (more appropriately named Lord Holyfox) who was a sympathizer of the Fellowship.

The Link and the Anglo-German Fellowship represented the cause of fascism in Britain. They were openly anti-masonic and anti-semitic. They were composed of identically the same type in Britain as those who composed the membership of the Cagoulard and the Croix de Feu in France (with which practically all of the Petain government of Vichy had been associated as members of fascist organizations in France for the past decade or two).

It is a well known fact that semi-official discussions have been under way for months in both Stockholm and Dublin. The leadership in these discussions for a negotiated British-Fascist peace has been undertaken by the very ones who have been outstanding in their association with the Anglo-German Fellowship and The Link.

The mass of the British people are in this war in deadly earnest, and if the British upper classes are pulling a 'Hesscapade' upon them, God help them when the final chapter is written!

Call It by Its Right Name—Fascism!

Social change came to Europe in the latter part of the First World War. The Bolshevik party climbed into the saddle in the October Revolution of 1917, and from then on it has dominated more than 8,000,000 square miles of territory with a communist philosophy. Fascism was born in 1919 almost

simultaneously in Italy and Bavaria. In Italy the fascist party under Mussolini was the first to achieve political supremacy—on October 28, 1922. Fascism in Bavaria under the leadership of Adolph Hitler and *under the nameplate of the Nazi party* had a setback in the Beerhall Putsch of Munich in 1923 and did not gain political supremacy until late 1933. Communism did not achieve any national success in the intervening years outside of Russia; while, on the other hand, the fascist doctrine of social operation has spread across Europe partly by infiltration and fifth column conspiracies and partly by conquest.

Europe today, October 1941, is composed of one communist controlled territory—Russia; two constitutional limited monarchies—Great Britain and Sweden; and, leaving aside Switzerland as being too small, the Turkish Republic. All other countries are either occupied by fascist forces or have adopted the fascist form of social operation, although their apparent structure of visual governmental administration may differ widely. *The occupation of France and Belgium was a walkover because of the complete national undermining of their governmental structure through the wholesale sell-out of their leadership to fascism.*

Therefore the only powers in Europe, outside of tiny Switzerland, that yet remain either unoccupied or not operated under a fascist social doctrine are Britain, Sweden, Turkey, and Russia. Of these Sweden is completely land-locked by enemy forces at the present time and unless liberated by military action through Norway or Finland cannot be counted on for active support. Turkey, unless won over by supplies and the promise of at least partial restoration of old Turkish territory, is not to be counted

* *Anglo-German Review.*

upon as being of much assistance. This, therefore, leaves Great Britain and Russia as the only two powers in Europe capable of and willing to continue the armed conflict against European fascism.

As stated previously in these pages, the United States of America is already committed by the action of its duly elected constitutional representatives to a policy of all-out aid to Britain, Russia, and China.

Britain's action so far has been the maintenance of a sea blockade, naval action against enemy shipping, and airforce action against the enemy. The land action of the British at the present time is limited to the small-scale operations in Libya, Egypt, Abyssinia, Syria, Iraq, and Iran. These operations are large in territorial expanse but minor in the scope of the armed conflict with the enemy. Russia is the only power opposing European fascism that is conducting large-scale military operations. On Russian soil her armies are fighting 6,000,000 soldiers of the armies of Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Finland, Italy, and other token forces.

President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill have announced on several occasions that their respective countries, United States and Great Britain, are irrevocably committed to the defeat of Hitler and Hitlerism. Adolph Hitler is Reich Chancellor of Germany. **There is no such thing as Hitlerism. There is fascism in Italy and fascism in Germany, fascism in Spain and fascism in France, but no such thing as Hitlerism exists as a mode of social operation.**

Never once in 2 years has any member of the government of the United States or of Great Britain given this titanic struggle its proper name.

Does this mean that they do not know

what the struggle is? The people of the respective countries have been misinformed as to the true nature of what they face. Technocracy would like to know why the leaders of the two countries have not made a positive contribution toward clearing up this misinformation so that the people of the United States and Great Britain can know the correct nature of this world struggle.

Are we being kidded into the belief that we are only fighting Adolph Hitler and his obnoxious party government of Germany? We of America must face the fact that we have already invested \$66 billion in being the world's arsenal of democracy, and we had damn well better know what and whom we're fighting before we go very much further!

Fascism in America

In the United States and on the North American Continent communism is a minor menace. The menace of Asiatic fascism on this Continent is practically nonexistent. Asiatic fascism has no roots here; its organized menace lies across the Pacific. The menace of European fascism exists not only abroad in Europe and through its alliance with Asiatic fascism, *but is the only fascism that has gained a foothold on this Continent.*

In North America any threat of communism is overshadowed 20 to 1 by the potential adherents of European fascism in our midst. The followers of European fascism in this country and this Continent, with their alien ideology, constitute the greatest single cause of national disunity extant. They are the largest, the most widespread, the most dangerous fifth column saboteurs of the United

States' program of national defense and the destiny of the North American Continent.

Do we of the United States, in becoming the arsenal of democracy, propose to fight fascism abroad while we encourage it at home? Technocracy is the only social dynamic with which this Continent can successfully oppose both fascism and communism.

Across the Pacific the United States faces the Shintoistic, Asiatic fascism of Japan; in Europe we face the antagonism of a European fascism. In Asia we are compelled to accept the aid of the incomplete fascism of the Chiang Kai-shek government of China in opposing Japan; in Europe we are being compelled to be the ally of the tory imperialism of Britain and the communism of Soviet Russia!

Present aid to Russia is being delayed and withheld because of fascist sympathizers in the United States who are doing everything within their power to further the cause of European fascism by blocking effective aid to Russia and Britain. The chief cry at this moment is that the United States should not aid Soviet Russia because we would be aiding a nation of godless and unchristian people. The sanctimonious hypocrisy of these perpetrators of fascism in our midst is only too obvious: They would refuse aid to Russia until they had converted the 170,000,000 Russians to their particular brand of religious and political faith.

May we digress historically . . . Did George Washington insist upon the moral reformation of the Seneca Indians before he accepted their aid in scalping the British soldiers? Did George Washington refuse to accept the aid of the French armies on American soil—soldiers more numerous than his own, soldiers of an absolute monarchy—that fought in America not to make the

Thirteen Colonies an independent republic, that did not care with whom they fought on American soil provided they fought the British? Did General Andrew Jackson before New Orleans, facing the brother-in-law of the Duke of Wellington, Lord Pakenham and his veterans of the Napoleonic Wars supported by the British fleet—did 'Old Andy,' when the notorious pirate Lafitte of the Spanish Main offered his unstinted aid, insist on Lafitte's spiritual absolution? He did not . . .

The United States can aid Soviet Russia as a fighting ally without succumbing to the curse of communism or insisting upon the spiritual absolution of 170,000,000 Russians.

United States and Great Britain have announced to the world their intent to defeat Germany and Hitler. Neither government at any time has ever announced that they are taking their world stand in opposition to and for defeat of *a method of social operation known as fascism*. Are United States and Great Britain only opposed to Hitler and Germany? Outside of Britain's declaration of war on Italy, neither United States nor Great Britain have made the national announcement that they are opposed to Italy, Hungary, France, Spain—or in other words the *entire* number of fascist nationals of Europe.*

As yet neither the United States nor Britain are opposed to Finland. United States is permitting the shipment of strategic supplies to France and Spain. The United States has been pursuing a policy of ap-

* Since December 7, 1941 the United States has been at war with Japan, Germany, Italy and, later, with Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary.

peasement to fascist Spain and France. The United States is trying to court General Weygand (who has been a fascist sympathizer for years) by permitting materials—oil and gasoline—to go to Weygand's north African bases, where through their use General Weygand can, with the forced labor of the prisoners of war of France, build the trans-Saharan Railroad connecting French Algeria with the port of Dakar in French West Africa. What kind of connivance and chicanery is this? For, upon the completion of this railroad, Europe will be able to create at Dakar one of the most powerful bases on the African side of the Atlantic at a point closest to the Americas!

The combined attack of the British fleet and General de Gaulle's Free French forces on Dakar resulted in a fiasco when General de Gaulle stopped the attack because he didn't want to slaughter Frenchmen. General de Gaulle, leader of the Free French, has the Cross of Lorraine for his symbol and has announced that if he and his allies are successful in reestablishing Free France he will establish a constitutional monarchy in France. What an ironic joke! A constitutional monarchy for France would be fascism under another name. Is General de Gaulle fooling the British or are the British fooling General de Gaulle?

There is continual propaganda in the press concerning incipient unrest in the occupied countries of Europe. That there is a certain amount of unrest is undoubtedly correct but that the unrest is in sufficient proportion and that revolt is imminent is far from the fact. The unrest is magnified by Germany and Italy in order to justify the wholesale methods of suppression and extermination. Isolated sabotage and oppo-

sition in Europe is welcomed because it provides the fascist domination with the opportunity for complete elimination of all the non-fascist elements of their populations. For us here in America to develop the hope that these daily incidents of execution, prison sentences, sabotage, and unrest are signs of a coming upheaval is a pathway of false wishfulfillment.

All propaganda of the press is minimizing the role of Russia in this struggle, but if Russia goes down to total defeat the United States cannot hope for any successful opposition to fascism in Europe. United States aid to Britain will then have to be predicated upon entirely different premises: It will be projected on the premise that the United States of America in aiding Great Britain will do her utmost to keep the British Isles unoccupied, but that such aid to Britain can no longer be forwarded across the Atlantic *on the false hope that Britain by herself can defeat a fascist Europe*; and, that our aid to Britain (in case of defeat of Russia) will be tantamount to paying installment rent for the use of the British navy.

So long as Britain and the United States can maintain Russia as a fighting ally, only so long can European fascism be faced with continuous armed conflict. Russia has the geographical area with ocean transport available on three seas. She has the manpower and the resources, and if adequately supplied would fill the historic European role of a continental ally of the British. If Russia goes down to destructive defeat Britain will have lost her greatest and last ally in Europe, and . . . *the United States will have lost her most powerful ally in Europe and Asia.*

PART II: BUSINESS AND PARTY POLITICS

Internally, our defense program is rumbling on its way, achieving some success with millions of blueprints for details without a single design for the entirety.

Rents, wages, prices, profits, and taxes are all soaring.

Publicity is pouring forth from public offices and from private business, each extolling what its organization is doing for defense. Every corporation in America that can advertise is bent on telling the people of United States how great its effort is in contributing to the defense of the country—at a handsome profit.

Advertisements appearing in our trade publications proclaim that nothing is too good for the \$21 a month boys in the army. Shades of 1917 grown bigger!

The United States government today is engaged in the sincere effort of creating the arsenal of democracy and the armed forces for defense of this country and this Continent. This war boom is somewhat different from any that ever preceded it, for in this boom *private business* is only financing 10 percent of the new plant construction necessary; 90 percent of the capital investment for our defense industry is money supplied by the government of the United States of America—public money.

In that sense the difference is astounding, for if this national situation is only a temporary emergency and due to end shortly, then private business will have all its cash and capital intact and only the United States government will 'hold the bag' of excess plant capacity across this Continent! Our

entire program of defense has been based on the false assumption that this country, by the substitution of government capital investment, could carry private enterprise and private capital through the hurly-burly expansion of the entire defense program and then have private enterprise come out at the end with its hide and hair intact!

Private business in United States convinced our government that if the government of the United States provided the capital and if business were permitted to realize on its initiative, national defense could be provided with sufficient speed to meet the international crisis. This, as Technocracy has hitherto pointed out, is being demonstrated as a national fallacy. All-out defense cannot be achieved by 'business as usual.'

It is estimated that our defense program at the present time is consuming only 15 percent of our productive output at an expenditure rate of approximately \$1 billion monthly. The defense program of the United States will have to be accelerated to the point where expenditures for defense will be between \$2 billion 500 million and \$3 billion monthly. Therefore, as the defense expenditures of the United States rise in volume toward the foregoing amounts, so too, will the government become the dominant 'enterprise' of this country.

Business has welcomed the profitable contracts of the defense program—contracts that could be produced with the existing

capacity of their corporate structures and with only a moderate increase in plant and equipment. Business, while welcoming the profitable contracts of the defense program, has continually opposed construction of additional plant capacity in practically every field of industry in this country. The 149 'dollar a year men,' business leaders drawn into the civilian administration of our defense program in Washington, have seen to it that the necessary expansion of plant capacity in steel, aluminum, magnesium, power, guns, and other facilities has been delayed and thwarted by their obstructionist tactics.

The leadership of national business in opposing this expansion of the defense program of the country has placed itself on record as being definitely anti-American. The stupidity of these tactics will become more obvious as the defense program in its amplification takes over more and more of the national endeavors of our economy. The expenditure of millions in advertising campaigns of a goodwill nature will be of no avail, for the public of this country has at least been educated by the Continent-wide transmission of news to such an extent that the more business enterprise tries to persuade and convince our population the more will the people become convinced that it is merely propaganda to save their own hides!

The defense program is rumbling on and is destined to become a structure so huge that it will dominate all national activities. Corporate enterprise would be wise to lay aside its traditional benefactions in this hour of our national need in order that it may participate in the common good. The leadership of corporate business had better realize that private enterprise is on its way out in the near future of this country. Their real-

ization of this trend cannot prevent its development, but if this is not realized they stand in great danger of having their personal existence terminated with the demise of corporate enterprise. United States will shortly decide whether we shall have defense or business, *and the U.S.A. will decide for defense.*

Technology has just begun to march.

During the last decade the expansion of our technological equipment was almost nil except those few projects planned and financed by direct government funds. The administration could not get the popular support for sufficient large-scale capital expenditures to amplify the technological equipment of our country on a Continental scale. God has been kind to the Roosevelt administration: He produced a world war just in time. The advent of the Second World War immediately created the popular support for tremendous expansion. The public willingly consents to the expenditure of billions under the pressure of fear where they previously lacked the foresight to authorize the expenditure of millions for a needed projection of national investment.

U. S., An Exporter—of Humanitarianism

Business and politics hail the Second World War as providing an opportunity for United States to take on the role of dominating the world's export trade. Volumes are written, and every day radios blare forth the great senility that the United States must capture the export markets of South America, Asia, Africa, and Australasia. Illusions of grandeur, dreams of world loot, a verbal cinema of a chiseler's utopia!

This country is not a nation of exporters and importers; the United States is a nation of consumers. United States' greatest market is here on this Continent. This country and this Continent consume in normal times 96 percent of U. S. production; only 4 percent of our production is exported abroad. Even in 1918 the United States only exported 10 percent of its total production under stress of World War Number One.

The doctrine of 'The American Century' is being loudly propagandized by numerous pathetic pathologists of debt in this land of ours. They draw vivid pictures of United States' future trade with China growing, if properly encouraged, to \$2, \$4, or even \$6 billions a year. They naively propose such a splendiferous future that China and Asia must develop a huge market for American goods. They are so far convinced that, if the poor heathen Chinese is either unwilling or unable to create this gigantic market for American goods, we of United States should immediately send forth a vast army to reconstruct the national life of China so that it could become a great export market for the United States. Business enterprise in the United States licks its chops in contemplation of the prospect of Tammany-izing China for a great rake-off.

Our future does not lie in foreign trade. Our national destiny presents us with the problem of raising the purchasing power of all the people on this Continent so that they may become the greatest nation of consumers on earth—195,000,000 strong.

Our 'good neighbor policy' in South America is dispensing kindness and light with one hand while it dispenses brotherly love and billions of American dollars with the other. If any one of the fascist South American national entities wants a steel

plant, a power house, a flock of airplanes, or a stack of guns, all it has to do is sidle up to Nelson Rockefeller, cultural administration representative, or caress our State Department and the necessary cash and equipment will be dispatched to our darker neighbors P.D.Q.

We loaned \$20 million to Brazil for a new steel plant, and most of the equipment has already been shipped: The steel industry of United States has consistently fought the vitally necessary expansion of the steel industry at home yet it countenances and promotes, in conjunction with our State Department, the erection of a modern steel plant in South America!

The United States is going to be a big brother to all the backward nations. Abroad we are the soul of generosity, at home we typify the spirit of old Scrooge.

We have undertaken all possible aid to Great Britain (which is necessary in order to maintain Britain in our national strategy of procuring time, territory, and technology for adequate Continental defense). Great Britain's food needs for 1942 call for considerable expansion in our agricultural production. United States' shipments of food to Great Britain for next year can be gauged by some of the British requirements of supply from this country. In 1942 Britain asks that United States ship 500 million dozen eggs, 1 billion 500 million pounds of pork and lard. The U. S. Department of Agriculture has estimated that our agricultural production can be increased 15 percent for next year. We can increase our agricultural production by that or a greater amount with comparative ease through greater mechanization. The task of feeding Britain is not formidable.

If that were the limit of feeding propo-

sals, we could take it in our stride, but—Herbert Clark Hoover is at it again. In the last war he served as Belgian Relief Commissioner and came into the limelight of world publicity for the first time. Now, he not only wants to feed the Belgians but he proposes to feed the French (Free and Occupied), the Dutch and the Danes, and if he hasn't thought up the Norwegians he will next week. Proposals are coming across the stage of public opinion in rapid order that the United States also feed the Poles, the Czechs, the Jugoslavs, the Greeks, the Latvians, the Esthonians, the Lithuanians, and even the Spaniards.

It is astounding to realize that the humanitarianism being promulgated across our broad land today is an export humanitarianism. We propose to export it to almost any place on earth with a strict guarantee to the trade that it is *brand new* and has never been used at home, and we promise to give it to you wholesale.

Technocracy Proposes Rationing Control of Flow Lines

It was stated previously in this article that Technocracy is the only social dynamic with which this Continent can successfully oppose both fascism and communism. America must organize and execute swiftly and efficiently.

Price inflation is well under way. The new tax bill has upped the individual citizen's contribution to the government income. This tax bill is only a starter; next year's tax bill will really be on its way. Special legislation has been passed to empower the division of federal price administration with the necessary legal authority

to attempt to control prices and the standard of living. Prices cannot be controlled by legislation, free markets, priorities, or unlimited individual corporate competitive purchasing. *The standard of living and a price level can be controlled in only one way; that is through the complete control of all national flow lines of goods and services.*

If prices, rents, profits, and wages are permitted to soar, then the cost of living automatically soars with them. Wages cannot be frozen unless rents and the prices of services and materials are also frozen. The present policy of fixing a price ceiling for many materials slightly higher than the previous price level is at best only a poor hypocrisy in that such action is taken in reality to provide a greater price spread for the existing handlers of those materials, and is thus practically a guarantee of greater profits than at the old price level.

Does United States propose to produce for defense or does it propose to operate on the competitive practices of private enterprise? Nationally, we should have made the decision long ago, and we will have to make it immediately in order to prevent the complete bogging down of our program of defense. If United States is going to operate its program of defense at high enough speed to complete the requirements in time, the competitive practices of private enterprise will have to be abandoned.

Under this situation the United States government could rule that the title to all such materials (whether originating from agriculture, mining, manufacturing, the forest, or the sea) shall be transferred to the United States government before they can be shipped by any common carrier—rail,

truck, air, or marine. In this way the United States government could control all material flow lines and all prices. Of course it also means the entire abolition of open markets and competitive trading, buying, selling, and corporative purchasing . . . Technocracy proposes this Continental system of rationing control as the only solution to the control and simplification of our program of national defense and, equally, of a guaranteed standard of living at frozen price levels.

The present system of contracts, purchases, transportation, and invoice payments of our defense program is daily becoming a more hideous mess. Every corporation with a government contract first proceeds to get a contract priority (if possible between 1 and 10), and then proceeds to grab its materials wherever it can lay hands on them. Every contractor of army and navy bases proceeds to purchase on individual purchase orders for each specific contract.

Individual corporate purchasing will have to be abolished and substituted by mass government purchasing reduced to the simple formula: that every purchase order is for the 30-day operation-output of mine, factory, or operating unit.

Under present practices ten thousand purchasing orders might be shipped to a large cement plant within 30 days by two thousand different contractors building the defenses required by our defense program; under Technocracy's proposal the entire output of the cement plant is purchased on a blanket output purchasing order, thereby avoiding the tremendous issuance of purchasing orders, shipping bills, invoices, and government checks.

All production under government mass purchasing order of bulk materials and of quantity produced surplus will be shipped to regional Commodity Terminals accurately located at transportation centers and producing centers both across the country and at seaboard. These Commodity Terminals then become the reserve materiel bank of the United States.

All shipments of materiel, whether by land, sea, or air, are no longer consigned to individual consignees. All materiel is consigned to materiel banks in specific Commodity Terminals. This eliminates forever the tremendous red-tape paper work that is choking up our defense program today. All materiel for consumption in the Regional Division of a Commodity Terminal is consigned from the materiel bank of that Commodity Terminal to the ultimate consumers, whether they be individuals, corporations, or government services. This would also be the greatest preventative of fifth column sabotage because no producer, worker, or shipper would know what goods were consigned where at any time.

Technocracy Proposes National Service for All

Technocracy has stated before and will say it again, that America faces simultaneously both opportunity and disaster. Destiny knocks at the door of this Continent—the doorway to a new Continental social order. The march of events decrees that America must face the greatest issue of all time.

The defense program has been sold to big business as a potentiality of producing the greatest income profit in history.

The defense program has been sold to the labor unions on the basis of a legislative, enforced increase in membership and a wider market for union labor.

The defense program has been sold to finance capital on the proposition that government funds will be used in the promotion, construction, and operation of all the hazardous developments of defense (wherein government loans create, not only the major portion of defense but also, the major amount of economic grease to operate the non-defense business as well) thereby guaranteeing a safe, sound investment return on all the projects of finance capital.

The defense program has been sold to the public on the general proposition that when private enterprise can no longer finance its own profitable prosperity, it is only just and meet that private enterprise should permit our government to finance prosperity for business, the common good, and defense.

Our government has sold all of these through the process of economic bribery. Our government has signally failed to sell

our defense program to the men who are going to do the defending, the \$21 a month boys. The U. S. A. still has to do the greatest job of selling of all; that is of selling the defense of this country and this Continent to those who are going to do the fighting.

This can only be done by creating a prestige for national service that wholly transcends the present day social prestige of the chiseler and the go-getter. National service must be created as the outstanding career for the men and women of our nation in place of profitable business.

Technocracy contends that national service should be made a permanent national duty of American citizenship.

Technocracy contends that the structure of national and Continental defense cannot be created by any process of profitable business.

Technocracy asks every American the question: Which do you want, business or defense?

Upon your answer rests the fate of the nation.

—————The End—————

Technocracy
Urges the Total Con-
scription of Men, Ma-
chines, Materiel, and
Money—With National
Service From All and
Profits to None!

America
Must Liquidate Its
Pro-fascists at Home
..... Before It Can
Defeat Its Fascist
Enemies Abroad!

Section Stamp

SEC. 1, REGIONAL DIVISION 11732
TECHNOCRACY INC.
724 E Street
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA